

Requirement on the ground that no adequate reasons and/or examples have been provided to support a conclusion of patentable distinctness between the claims of Groups I and II.

The Examiner has asserted that the inventions of Groups I and II are unrelated, because they have different modes of operation. However, no explanation of how the methods of the two restricted Groups operate in different modes has been provided. In particular, it is noted that the method of Claim 8 of Group I involves two of the three steps recited in Claim 22 of Group II. No explanation has been provided as to how the modes of operation of the two methods which share common step(s) differ.

For all of these reasons, the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that the present application is now ready for examination on the merits, and early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No.: 24,618



**22850**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stephen G. Baxter' with a stylized flourish at the end.

Stephen G. Baxter, Ph.D.  
Registration No.: 32,884

PHONE: (703) 413-3000  
FAX: (703) 413-2220  
I:\atty\SGB\212224US-rrq.wpd